Remarks

The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of Claims 7 and 8. Both Claims 7 and 8 have now been cancelled. Also, Claim 1 has been amended to change the arithmetic average surface roughness range of "0.003 μm to 0.025 μm" to "0.004 μm to 0.020 μm."

The Applicants respectfully request that that above amendments to Claim 1 be entered into the official file. The Applicants respectfully submit that these changes do not raise new issues or cause a need for further searching inasmuch as the subject matter added to Claim 1 has already been examined in Claims 7 and 8 on one hand and the changed range of arithmetic average surface roughness is inherently within the previously claimed range. Also, the changes include cancellation of two claims, thereby simplifying matters for further consideration.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the hypothetical combination of Murata with Oka. The Applicants respectfully submit that even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination, the films resulting from that combination would still be different from what the Applicants claim. Reasons are set forth below.

The Applicants first note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments hypothetically applying Murata and Oka against the claims, including the "Answers to Applicants' Arguments" section. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Applicants believe that there is an error in the interpretation of the disclosure of Murata. In particular, the "Answers to Applicants' Arguments" section states:

> Applicant argues that Murata discloses Ra in the range of 0.03-0.3 microns and Applicant claims 0.003-0.025. Murata discloses that Ra is about 0.03-0.3 microns. The term about includes values below and above the cited ranges. Therefore, about 0.03 is deemed to read on 0.025.

The Applicants have carefully reviewed Murata, including the section highlighted in the rejection on page 3 at line 2 of the Official Action regarding the arithmetic average surface roughness and note the reference to column 3, lines 61-64. The Applicants respectfully submit that the term "about" is not used in that text. The Applicants reproduce that text from column 3 below for the Examiner's convenience as follows:

> The glittering phenomenon of the displayed images would be strong when Ra exceeds 0.30 μm while no sufficient antiglare effect can be exhibited when Ra is smaller than 0.03 μm.

It can be seen from this exact disclosure that the word "about" never appears in that location. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no other location in Murata where the term "about" is applied in connecting with the arithmetic average surface roughness Ra. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that this portion of the reasoning in the rejection is inapplicable. Therefore it inherently follows that the Applicants' Claim 1, which also does not contain the term "about," may not be "deemed to read on" the previously claimed 0.25 μm range. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is, in fact, a meaningful gap between Murata and the prior Claim 1.

For the sake of further clarifying this difference, the Applicants have changed 0.025 μm to 0.020 μm. The Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that there was no overlap before, that there was, in fact, a meaningful gap before and that the gap is now even more substantial. On this basis alone, the Applicants respectfully submit that even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination, the resulting film would still not be what the Applicants claim. This is because there is a gap between Murata and what the Applicants claim and Oka fails to provide specific arithmetic surface roughness Ra figures at all. Thus, the combination would result in a film that has an arithmetic surface roughness Ra outside the Applicants' claimed range.

There are further problems associated with the arithmetic surface roughness Ra range taught by Murata. As noted above in the section taken from column 3, lines 61-64 of Murata, no sufficient antiglare effect can be exhibited when Ra is smaller than 0.03 μm. This description means that Murata relates to antiglare material and Oka relates to a similar type of antiglare material. Therefore, the explanation concerning Ra of Murata can readily be applied to the Oka disclosure as well. In other words, the range of Ra of Oka and Murata achieve the desired antiglare effect.

However, the arithmetic average surface roughness Ra of the Applicants' ranges from 0.004 to 0.020 μm. The Applicants invite the Examiner's attention to page 26 of their specification in the last paragraph which states:

> When the arithmetic average surface roughness Ra is above the range, the resin layer (d) has high haze, that is, the transparency thereof is low. In contrast, when the arithmetic average surface roughness Ra is below the range, the scratch resistance is low.

This demonstrates that the Applicants were not concerned with the antiglare effect of Murata and Oka. Instead, their concerns were elsewhere. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not look to Murata or Oka with respect to the arithmetic surface roughness.

As noted above, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of Claim 7. In that regard, Claim 1 recites a hard coat layer (b) and an electrically conductive layer (c), respectively. This means that the Applicants have a substrate film (a), a hard coat (b), an electrically conductive layer (c) and a resin layer (d). This means that the Applicants' multilayer film comprises a specific film and three specific layers.

This is sharply contrasted to Oka which has a hard coat function and an electrically conductive function in the same layer. Thus, Oka has a substrate film, an antiglare layer and a low refracted index layer. The antiglare layer has the hard coat function and the electrically conductive function. This means that Oka discloses specific film and two specific layers. Thus, the fundamental disclosure between Oka and Claim 1 is quite different.

Also, if Oka is satisfied with an electrically conductive layer (c) having a conductive particle content of 70% to 90% by weight, the antiglare of Oka cannot have the hard coat function. The reason for this is that a content of 70% to 90% is quite large. In sharp contrast, the Applicants separate the hard coat layer function from the electrically conductive layer function. This means that the electrically conductive layer (c) can be satisfied with the conductive particle content of 70% to 90% by weight. Thus, this is yet another difference over Oka (and Murata).

As noted above, the Applicants have added the subject matter from Claim 8 into Claim 1. This means that resin layer (d) contains a fluorine-containing polymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain. Thus, the Applicants' multilayer film discloses wet coating methods to form resin layer (d). In sharp contrast, Oka discloses a fluorine inorganic compound, that does not disclose the claimed fluorine organic compound. This means that it inherently does not disclose the fluorine polymer. Therefore, Oka discloses dry coating methods to form the lower refractive index layer, for example, plasma CVD, ion plating and the like. Therefore, this represents yet another significant difference between Oka (and Murata) and the claimed subject matter.

The result of these at least three significant differences is that even if one skilled in the art were to hypothetically combine Murata with Oka, the resulting film would still be quite different from the Applicants' claimed subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vbm
(215) 656-3381